

the right to free speech and would be unconstitutional in the United States.

Let us intimately examine the very real and humanitarian effects of withholding funding for international family planning. Oftentimes, facilities which provide family planning information also provide the majority of health-related services to a given population. When the only health care facility in a rural community closes due to insufficient operating costs, who pays the price? The impoverished mother of seven seeking a tubal ligation to prevent future unplanned pregnancies pays the price. Young newlyweds desiring to learn about oral contraception and condom use, as well as natural family planning pays the price. A village in need of medical treatment for tuberculosis, malaria, iron-deficiency, or any other illness unrelated to reproductive issues pays the price.

If the United States is serious about its resolve to enhance the democracies, economies, health and education infrastructures, and human living conditions in the developing world, then it must acknowledge the interdependence of these sectors in a country's development. Why should we realistically expect to witness significant increases in economic growth within the trade, banking, or manufacturing industries when much of a country's population remains formally uneducated without access to basic medical services and information?

The difficult process of international development requires a comprehensive approach, congressional funds appropriated for this purpose have a proven track record of effectiveness, but are in need of continued support. NGO's and health care facilities provide invaluable services that a developing nation's government is often unable to provide for financial reasons. Understand unequivocally that no U.S. federal funds provide abortion services in this country or abroad. Let us never again allow this fact to be blurred within our discussions and debates with supporters of the global gag rule.

The removal of the Mexico City language from the Foreign Operations appropriations bill was a declaration by the United States that it is truly committed to the democratic principles upon which the nation was conceived. The bill reaffirms our proactive concern for impoverished and underserved people throughout the globe. It is my sincere hope that the new administration will demonstrate the compassion and moral leadership of the United States by retaining as a top priority the health and well being of women, children, and families worldwide.

IN HONOR OF F. WHITTEN PETES, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Madam Speaker, today I rise in tribute to the Honorable F. Whitten Peters, the outgoing Secretary of the Air Force, who recently left office to return to private life.

In his 4 years as Under Secretary, Acting Secretary and Secretary, Whit Peters led America's Air Force during a period of unprecedented change. Under his inspired leadership, the Air

Force evolved from the garrison force that won the Cold War to the Expeditionary Aerospace Force that dominated the skies over Kosovo and Serbia, deterred conflict around the globe, and delivered comfort to the afflicted in over 100 nations during the last year alone.

With unflagging energy and unfailing good humor, Secretary Peters has attached and overcome a broad array of resource problems affecting the Air Force. Colleagues on both sides of the aisle will well remember his work with us to secure additional resources for aircraft spare parts. He labored tirelessly to ensure that aircraft maintainers had the tools and equipment required to perform their important duties. And he made revolutionary use of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve members to augment members of the Regular Air Force in keeping our aircraft flying. As a result of these and many other significant initiatives, the Air Force arrested a decade-long decline in aircraft readiness.

With similar vigor and success, Secretary Peters has led the development of the Air Force as the service leader in the national security space arena. Today, the United States Air Force provides over 85 percent of the national security space funding and 90 percent of the people who perform the national security space mission.

More important, under Secretary Peters' deft guidance, the Air Force made national security space assets more responsive and more relevant to our national defense than ever before. He built pioneering partnerships between NASA, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the Air Force to rapidly exploit emerging technologies that will move vital intelligence information to field commanders in minutes rather than months.

But, even with the most daunting challenges of global crises, emerging technologies and constrained resources, the 700,000 men and women of America's Air Force have always been his most important concern. His unceasing efforts on their behalf in the halls of this building resulted in a better quality of life and better compensation for every Air Force member. As a result, the Air Force exceeded its recruiting goals in 2000 and is ahead of schedule for 2001.

When Whit Peters came to the Office of the Secretary, he had inherited declining retention rates among the troops at all levels. But his efforts have paid off. For the first 3 months of this fiscal year, first-term airmen are re-enlisting at rates above the Air Force's goal, a goal that is already higher than the goal of any other service. And the Air Force's pilot shortage has been cut by a third in just over a year.

My colleagues, today the Air Force is better, much better, America is stronger, and the world is safer because of the dedication, sacrifice and hard work of Secretary Whit Peters. I know my colleagues will join me in wishing him

good luck and Godspeed as he returns to private life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HISTORIC DAY FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, today was an historic day for the United States because our President, George W. Bush, announced a new office for faith-based initiatives.

Many of us have worked for many years, as has President Bush and the State of Texas, in many of these initiatives and are very excited about what the President has done. There have been many people toiling away in our inner cities, in our rural areas, and other places trying to extend a helping hand to the poor, yet often ignored in the public arena, while many groups who have been less effective have been able to get the funds.

Nobody is arguing that there are not well-meaning people in multiple bureaucracies of the Federal Government and of State and local governments. But we also know that many of the most life-changing experiences, many of the most effective programs, have actually occurred at the neighborhood level, the grassroots level, from people who live in those communities, who work in those communities, who are deeply invested; they leverage the funds, and yet they are not eligible when we have different programs.

□ 1900

We have had a number of amendments through this House, some of which have died in the Senate, some of which were vetoed, and some of which are law in the charitable choice provisions.

President Bush has gone one step farther. Not only has he said that he favors these charitable choice provisions in allowing, under rigid conditions, nobody can proselytize, nobody can try to push their religious faiths on somebody else, but for Christians who want to do service for others, to try to extend those dollars, whether it be in housing, in juvenile justice, whether it be in certain after-school programs, whether it be helping the homeless, whether it be helping people with AIDS, that Christian and Muslim and Hindu and Buddhist and Jewish organizations can now apply for those grants.

In addition to what he has done at the legislative proposal level, he has asked the executive branch agencies to analyze their programs internally to see where they have reached out, to see what has worked and what has not worked and where they might expand that.

He also has a package for a charitable tax credit for nonitemizers, for example, something that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) pushed here for years, that I have had legislation as well, to try to expand the charitable credit that was in the bill of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and Jim Talent that we have argued, that former Senator Dan Coats advocated in the Senate and worked with, because a tax credit that would put additional dollars into the charitable organizations that are having such an impact at the local level would be a major breakthrough.

What we have seen out of our new President is not just a talk that related to the campaign to try to win but a comprehensive blueprint of how to actually accomplish this in office. That is not something that gains necessarily a lot of votes. Not a lot of lobbyists come to our office saying, hey, we will financially support you if you just back this faith-based initiative thing.

It comes with a lot of controversy because a lot of people, rightly to some degree, fear that this could be over-extended, and they do not understand the full nature of this and the court limitations on it, and they are worried about religious liberty. But President Bush has stood up and said, this is too important, there are too many kids and families hurting in this country to continue to ignore the most effective way to reach many of these children who need our help.

I cannot say enough in praise of this initiative. I am excited about the Office of Faith-Based Initiatives. I am looking forward to the legislation that we will be bringing to the floor to work with this and to work with this office. This is a great morning in America today for many people who really need the help not only of the government but of their neighbors and the communities and the churches and others who can do so much to give them a chance in this wonderful free country.

ON THE GLOBAL GAG RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PLATTS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my extreme disappointment that the global gag rule has been imposed on U.S. assistance to international family planning programs once again. On his second full day in office, President Bush reinstated this Reagan-era restriction, gagging foreign private organizations from using their own funds to educate women and families about their full range of reproductive choices.

For decades, U.S. aid to family planning organizations overseas has helped these groups provide invaluable services for women around the world. Our Nation has a history of helping women educate themselves and to providing

access to needed reproductive health services. I assure my colleagues that piling on restrictions to censor what foreign organizations can and cannot do with their own private funds is nothing to be proud of.

Each year in the developing world, nearly 600,000 women die from pregnancy-related complications. That is why our support for a full range of reproductive health services, including contraception, health workshops, counseling and maternal care becomes more important every day.

By imposing the gag rule, President Bush is taking away a woman's right to make decisions, decisions that affect her reproductive health, her emotional and physical security, and her family's future. President Bush is imposing his own values on foreign groups, and he is limiting these groups to providing only the services that get his seal of approval.

The truth is that family planning programs reduce the need for abortion. They promote safe motherhood and they increase child survival. Denying women birth control and counseling creates more unwanted pregnancies, more abortions, and more suffering. It is also a fact that more than 75,000 women die each year due to unsafe abortion. Without access to safe and affordable services, abortion will be less safe and will put more women's lives in danger.

I know that the women of this House are more committed than ever to protect the rights of women around the world. We have a responsibility to work to reduce the rate of unwanted pregnancy and improve the lives of women and children at home and abroad.

Implementing a global gag rule is not the way to meet this goal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. DAVIS of California addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HONESTY AND GLOBAL GAG RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, by reinstituting the global gag rule as one of his first actions in office, President Bush quickly revealed how uncompassionate his conservatism will be. The gag rule will take money away from the world's poorest women and girls. This is not the action of a moderate.

The gag rule prevents doctors from giving the best medical advice to patients, it stops free speech, and it limits the effectiveness of family planning organizations. So this gag rule is not

about preventing taxpayer dollars from being used for abortions, no matter what the President's spokesman says.

This is a significant point. Language is important. By using language that leads people to believe that the ban will stop taxpayer money from being used for abortions, the Bush administration gave a positive spin to a negative action. We need to call them on it. That is why many of us are on the floor tonight.

This is not about taxpayer money being used for abortion. It could not be. No American dollars have been used for abortions since 1973. That is the law of this country. The gag rule is about preventing organizations from giving good medical advice and care to patients. It coerces family planning clinics, doctors and organizations into sacrificing their right to counsel patients or even participate in democratic debates in order to receive U.S. funding for voluntary family planning services. It will stop much needed family planning funding from going to the organizations that provide the services that prevent abortions. It forces providers to make a terrible choice, give up desperately needed funding for family planning services or sacrifice their rights and responsibilities. Either way, women lose and the number of abortions, particularly illegal abortions, will rise.

The gag rule would be unconstitutional here in the United States, and it is unconscionable that among the first acts of the Bush administration was to reinstate it and impose it on the world's poorest women and girls. During the campaign, President Bush said that the United States should not appear arrogant in its foreign policy. Imposing limits on speech that would be unconstitutional here in the United States is the height of arrogance in foreign policy.

That is not to say that all the news is bad. I was pleased to hear that President Bush has committed to retaining the fiscal year 2001 funding levels for international family planning. That was a very welcome statement. I hope that when President Bush takes another look at the facts, he will recognize that his actions actually encourage the procedure he is trying to reduce.

We know that family planning reduces the need for abortions. We know that it saves lives. The gag rule reduces the effectiveness of family planning organizations and should be eliminated. I urge the President to revoke the gag rule. I applaud my many colleagues that have joined me in doing so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. PELOSI addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]